

Formal Drawings

Applicants note the informality of the drawings as filed. Applicants will file formal drawings upon receipt of a Notice of Allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 - 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,781,909 to Logan et al. As outlined below, Claims 1 – 20 recite patentable subject matter that is neither taught nor suggested by the '909 reference.

The '909 reference is directed toward a satellite kiosk management system. According to the teachings of the '909 patent, a supervisory computer controls the bounds of content that can be viewed at the kiosk station. This is accomplished by downloading from the supervisory computer to the kiosk a control file and hypertext document files. The control file determines which remotely stored information the kiosk is allowed to access, and provides information used to alter retrieved documents prior to display. The control file is resident on the kiosk, and thus, the bounds of the kiosk 'universe' are locally controlled once the control file is downloaded. Also, document alteration is performed locally, at the kiosk. The kiosk user is permitted to browse documents of his or her own choosing, as long as they are within the bounds defined by the control file.

Although Applicants believe original Claim 1 to be patentably distinct over the '909 patent, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to more clearly define the invention. Referring now to Claim 1, The '909 patent does not teach or suggest a first computer and second computer in communication with a control site computer as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, the '909 patent does not teach or suggest enabling a first computer to cause at least one second computer to display a selected file. As stated, the '909 patent simply teaches bounding or predefining the universe of files that a kiosk computer user is permitted to access.

Furthermore, the '909 patent does not teach or suggest a control site causing a selected file to be displayed on a second computer by receiving a request for the selected file from the first

computer, retrieving the selected file, and modifying the retrieved selected file by disabling pointers from the selected file before transmitting it to the second computer.

Still further, the '909 patent does not teach or suggest a control site generating two files, one with pointers modified to direct the user's computer to the control site and another with pointers disabled, and sending the first file to the first computer and the second modified file to the second computer.

For these independent and alternative reasons, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Amended Claim 1, and its Dependent Claims 2 – 3.

With reference to Claim 9, and its Dependent Claims 10 – 14, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of these claims. The '909 patent does not teach or suggest a pilot computer causing a passenger computer to display a predetermined Web page by the pilot computer transmitting a URL of the predetermined page to a control site, the control site sending an active control to the pasenger Web browser causing it to download the predetermined Web page from the control site. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 9, and its Dependent Claims 10 – 14.

Further with regard to claims 11 and 12, the 909 patent does not teach or suggest encoding hyperlinks on the web page to point to the control site prior to downloading the Web page to a pilot computer or disabling hyperlinks on the web page prior to downloading the Web page to a passenger computer. For at least this additional reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 11 and 12.

With regard to Claim 15, and its dependent claims 16 – 20, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of these claims as well. The '909 patent does not teach or suggest transmitting a URL of a predetermined page to a control site, the control site retrieving the predetermined page and transmitting active control to a passenger computer, and the passenger computer downloading the predetermined page from the control site. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 15, and its Dependent Claims 16 – 20.

New Claims

Applicants have added new Claims 21 – 43 to further define the invention. These claims are patentably distinct over the '909 reference in that they recite systems, methods or computer programs for causing one or more selected files to be viewed on at least one second computer.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn.

Dated: *January 4, 1999*

Respectfully submitted,

LYON & LYON LLP

By:

Daniel N. Yannuzzi
Reg. No. 36,727

First Interstate World Center
633 West Fifth Street, 47th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2066
Phone: (619) 552-8400
Fax: (213) 955-0440